

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 15, 16, 27, 29 and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants by the Examiner during Examiner's telephonic interview with Applicant's representative, which took place on September 24, 2007. During the aforesaid interview, the parties discussed the patentability of the pending claims, but no agreement was reached.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 6 because of certain informalities. In response, Applicants make appropriate correction, which is believed to be fully responsive to Examiner's objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15, 16, 18-27 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Olive et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,790,978). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of Applicants' amendments to independent claims 1, 13, 15, 27, 29 and 30 and further in view of the following arguments.

Specifically, without admitting that Olive et al. in fact teaches or suggests any of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 13, 15, 27, 29 and 30 to recite a feature of the invention, wherein the discourse functions are being determined based on a mapping between basic discourse constituents of the determined theory of discourse analysis and a plurality of discourse functions. The corresponding disclosure teaching this feature is can be found, for example, at paragraph [0023] of the specification. In addition,

independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 30 are being amended to recite a feature of the invention, wherein a theory of discourse analysis is selected from a plurality of theories of discourse analysis based on the speech to be synthesized. The corresponding disclosure describing this feature can be located at paragraph [0021] of the specification. The above two features of the invention, the recitations of which have been added to the respective independent claims are not taught or suggested by Olive et al.

In more detail, Olive et al. fails to teach or suggest selecting a theory of discourse analysis is from a plurality of theories of discourse analysis based on the speech to be synthesized. In Olive et al., the pitch contours are computed from input text using parameterized equations whose parameters can be estimated directly from natural speech recordings, see Olive et al., col. 1, lines 51-53. Olive et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed theory of discourse analysis, the claimed plurality of theories of discourse analysis and also fails to teach or suggest selecting a theory of discourse analysis is from a plurality of theories of discourse analysis based on the speech to be synthesized. Even assuming for purposes of argument only that the parameterized equations of Olive et al. can be considered as a theory of discourse analysis, Olive et al. teaches using only one such theory and does not teach selecting a theory of discourse analysis is from a plurality of theories of discourse analysis based on the speech to be synthesized.

Moreover, Olive et al. is entirely silent with respect to the second claimed feature of the invention recited in the amended claims, wherein the discourse functions are being determined based on a mapping between basic discourse constituents of the determined theory of discourse analysis and a plurality of discourse functions. Olive et al. fails to disclose the claimed basic discourse constituents of the determined theory of discourse analysis. In addition, there is no

such mapping disclosed anywhere in Olive et al., much less its use for determining the discourse functions. For this reason, Olive et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the two foregoing features of the invention and, therefore, the amended independent claims 1, 13, 15, 27, 29 and 30 are not anticipated by Olive et al.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4-12, 16 and 18-26, while continuing to traverse the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of Olive et al., used by the Examiner in rejecting these claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims is rendered moot by the present amendments of the parent claims 1, 13 and 15 and that these claims are patentable by definition, by virtue of their dependence upon the patentable independent claims 1, 13 and 15.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 14 and 28 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Olive et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,790,978) in view of Polanyi et al. (U.S. patent publication 2002/0083104). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of Applicants' amendments to the parent independent claims 13 and 27 and further in view of the following arguments.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 14 and 28, while continuing to traverse the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of Olive et al. and Polanyi et al., used by the Examiner in rejecting these claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims is rendered moot by the present amendments of the parent claims 13 and 27 and that these claims are patentable by definition, by virtue of their dependence upon the patentable independent claims 13 and 27.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Pavel I. Pogodin
Registration No. 48,205

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE
23493
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 25, 2007